



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/567,882

02/08/2006

Matthias Hoffmann

56817M521

2362

23363 7590 05/29/2009
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
PO BOX 7068
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

DIAZ, THOMAS C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3656

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/567,882	Applicant(s) HOFFMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner THOMAS DIAZ	Art Unit 3656	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) THOMAS DIAZ. (3) Richard Ridley.

(2) Saeid Mirsafian. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 26 May 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kraus (USP 2201670), Taubmann et al. (WO9951456A1), Hendrick (USP 2128483).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed changes to claim 1 were discussed and how those changes related to the prior art used in the rejection. No agreement was reached with respect to the proposed changes overcoming the prior art being used. We also discussed some questions regarding analogous art in the application and some clarification was given on what qualifies as analogous art in the application. No agreement on patentability of the application was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Thomas Diaz/ Examiner, Art Unit 3656	/Richard WL Ridley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3656
--	---